

that appeared in the Columbia, SC, "The State" as of yesterday, March 12, 1995.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STOP PLAYING GAMES WITH SOCIAL SECURITY
(By Senator Fritz Hollings)

"Nobody, Republican, Democrat, conservative, liberal, moderate, is even thinking about using Social Security to balance the budget."—Sen. Trent Lott, R-Miss., "Face the Nation," Feb. 2

In the recent weeks of floor debate and television interviews, many senators repeatedly pledged not to use Social Security funds to balance the budget.

They even passed an amendment by Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole to instruct the Budget Committee to develop a budget that didn't use Social Security funds but would conform with the constitutional balanced-budget amendment.

In the meantime, while Dole was struggling to pick up one vote to pass the amendment, five Democrats vowed they were ready, willing and able to vote for Social Security. In fact, the night before the vote, the five sent Dole a letter of commitment to vote for the amendment if Social Security were protected.

On March 2, the constitutional amendment failed by one vote. And over that weekend on "Face the Nation" Dole again reaffirmed his intent on Social Security when he said, "We are going to protect Social Security."

If he remains that committed, why did he refuse to put his word on the line in black and white on March 2 and pass a constitutional amendment by at least 70 votes? Because he knew that accepting the five Democratic votes would have cost him an equal number of votes of Republicans determined to spend Social Security surpluses on the deficit.

Dole didn't want to expose his Republican troops or expose the truth. While Republican rhetoric pledged to protect Social Security, Sen. Pete Domenici, chairman of the Budget Committee, and other Republicans were telling Dole that the budget could not be balanced without using Social Security surplus funds.

All of this word-battling—of saying one thing in public and trying to work around it in private—has led Americans to believe that there is a free lunch, that all we have to do to eliminate the deficit is to cut spending. The vote on Social Security exposes this myth.

Republican senators have no real intent on eliminating the deficit; they just want to move it from the federal government to Social Security.

Currently, Section 13.301 of the Budget Enforcement Act prohibits the use of Social Security funds for the deficit. But part of the balanced-budget amendment would repeal current law.

Even with all the promises tendered to correct Social Security with future legislation, any civics student knows you can't amend the Constitution with legislation. That's why the five Democrats—me included—insisted on including Social Security protection in the wording of the constitutional amendment.

Dole's stonewalling against our five votes on the constitutional amendment reveals another harsh truth: \$1.8 trillion in spending cuts is necessary to balance the budget in seven years. But many senators reveal their intent to use Social Security surpluses when they state that only \$1.2 trillion is necessary.

Let's face realities: There won't be enough cuts in entitlements. A jobs program for wel-

fare reform will cost. Savings here are questionable.

You can and should save some on health reform, but slowing the growth of health costs from 10 percent to 5 percent still means increased costs. Social Security won't be cut, and any savings by increasing the age of retirement would be allocated to the trust fund, not the deficit.

Both the GOP's "Contract with America" and President Clinton have called for increases in defense spending. Results: No savings.

Therefore, savings must come from spending freezes and cuts in the domestic discretionary budget.

Coupling these cuts and freezes with a closing of tax loopholes still isn't enough to meet the target of a balanced budget in seven years. That's why Domenici has determined that Social Security funds will have to be used.

But using Social Security won't eliminate the deficit. It simply would increase the amount we owe Social Security. Already we owe \$470 billion to the trust fund. If we keep raiding it, the government will owe Social Security more than \$1 trillion by 2002.

Harsh realities. But there's a fifth and even harsher reality. All of the spending cuts in the world aren't politically attainable now. Domenici knows it's hard to get votes for enough cuts. To his credit, he tried in 1986 with a long list of cuts by President Reagan and the Grace Commission. But he got only 14 votes in the Senate.

Rep. Gerald Solomon, a New York Republican, also tried a list of \$1 trillion in cuts just a year ago in the House. He got only 73 votes of 435.

In addition, the problem of balancing the budget with spending reductions is exacerbated by the "Contract With America's" call for a \$500 billion tax cut.

The reality today is that a combination of cuts, freezes, loophole closings and tax increases must be cobbled together to put us on a glide path to balancing the budget. Now is the time to stop the finger-pointing, the blaming of the other guy. Now is the time to stop dancing around the fire of changes in the process.

It's a pure sham to think that a constitutional balanced-budget amendment will give Congress discipline.

If you put a gun to the head of Congress, it will get more creative. The proof is in the pudding that's being cooked all over town.

Some tout abolishing departments, like Commerce and Education. But their functions would continue somewhere. Others say send everything back to the states. But that way, the states would pick up deficits instead of the federal government.

Of course we know some want to use \$636 billion in Social Security funds. And there's talk of picking up \$150 billion by recomputing the Consumer Price Index and another \$150 billion of re-estimating the growth of Medicare and Medicaid.

There are even those who want one-time savings, like selling the electric power grid or switching to the capital budget system.

In other words, there are people throughout town who are figuring out ways to make the federal budget appear balanced with hardly any cuts. With a balanced-budget amendment, they would be able to play this game for seven years.

Time out!

The gamesmanship, the charade, must stop. If this nonsense goes on for seven years, the United States will be down the tubes.

For all the talk about eliminating the deficit, the debt snowballs. Why? Because we add \$1 billion a day to the debt by borrowing to pay interest.

In January and throughout February, I offered 110 spending cuts or eliminations from domestic discretionary spending. This was worth \$37 billion in the first year and put deficit reduction on the glide path toward a balanced budget by 2002.

But even if these politically impossible cuts were agreed upon, the interest cost on the debt is growing at more than \$40 billion a year.

The United States is in a downward budget spiral and we are meeting ourselves coming around the corner. Like the Queen in "Alice in Wonderland" told Alice: "It takes all the running you can do, to keep in the same place. If you want to get somewhere else, you must run at least twice as fast as that!"

Let's get past all the shenanigans. Let's include Social Security protection in the balanced-budget amendment. Then we could pass the amendment and get down to the hard work of balancing the budget.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Madam President, this article brings right into true focus exactly what is going on.

If, as Mr. Krauthammer says in this particular article, it was just "a fiction", then why not just include this exception in the language of the constitutional amendment?

The distinguished leaders of the legislation willingly accepted an exception for borrowed funds. The distinguished leaders of the balanced budget amendment willingly accepted the provision dealing judicial enforcement in order to pick up the one vote of the Senator from Georgia.

Why, Madam President, did they not accept five votes when all they had to do was put in black and white what they were publicly saying? There are five Senators who are ready, willing, and able to vote for a constitutional amendment for a balanced budget if they include a provision protecting Social Security funds.

The real flip-floppers are those who have abandoned their position taken in 1990 that Social Security funds should not be used in deficit calculations. It is very difficult to get that message out, but we will keep hammering. The distinguished majority leader says that he will continue to bring this up. I look forward to that debate and can likewise promise that this Senator will continue to push for language that excludes Social Security from deficit calculations.

I yield the floor.

EULOGY TO GLEN P. WOODARD

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, Glen P. Woodard, the former vice president and director of community affairs for Winn-Dixie Food Stores, died on January 25, 1995, after an extended illness. As Winn-Dixie's community affairs director, Glen was widely known by food industry leaders and politicians for his handling of legislative and regulatory activities at both the State and national levels.

He moved to Florida at a young age, attending high school there and college at the University of Florida. He served in the U.S. Air Force 306 Bomb Group during World War II. Prior to joining

Winn-Dixie in 1957, he was executive secretary of the Florida Petroleum Industries for 11 years. In 1981, he was named Groceryman of the Year by the Retail Grocers Association of Florida.

At his funeral on January 28, Robert O. Aders, former president of the Food Marketing Institute, gave a warm and moving eulogy to his good friend, Glen Woodard. It captures Glen's sharp wit, down-home personality, and wonderful good-natured philosophy. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this excellent tribute be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EULOGY TO GLEN WOODARD

(By Robert O. Aders)

Glen, it is an honor to be invited to eulogize you. It is not the first time that I or others have praised you in public but it is the first time you won't have the last word. I speak on behalf of myself and Tabitha and your other close friends in the industry that you have served so well for so many years—on behalf of your many associates in FMI and other groups in Washington and the State capitols with whom you have worked to improve food system and the supermarket industry—to improve the quality of government—and to improve the relationships between industry and government—in order to better serve the public. We have enjoyed considerable success in all these things and you have truly left your mark. You have made a difference. And today we celebrate your life.

We all lead our lives on many levels—our home, our church, our country, daily work, recreation. So did Glen Woodard. I would like to say a few words on behalf of those who knew him mostly in his Washington life, that part of his Winn-Dixie career where some of us in this room were his extended family. Glen was born in Washington, D.C.—says so in the Jacksonville newspaper so it must be true. But Glen always denied that. He didn't want to be a Washington insider. Instead Glen told a Supermarket News reporter who asked where he was born:

"Born in North Georgia in 1917, RFD 1, Clermont. Go out from Gainesville, turn left at Quillens store, going toward the Wahoo Church, and then past there up toward Dahlonga. We lived there till the Grand Jury met—then moved to Florida."

My friendship with Glen goes back a long way. We both joined the supermarket industry 38 years ago. In 1957 Glen joined Winn-Dixie and I joined Kroger—he as a lobbyist, I as a lawyer.

These were the good old days of smaller government but it was growing and soon Kroger decided to form a government relations department. I was chosen to do it. We were going to lobby and all I knew about that was what you had to go through when you check into a hotel. Then I got lucky. The American Retail Federation was holding a regional conference in Springfield, Illinois, and the already-famous Glen Woodard was the featured speaker on "lobbying." Glen spoke on the nitty-gritty of working with government—the day-to-day task of dealing with small problems so they don't get big—the same way we all deal with our family and business problems. He spoke on the day-to-day things that government does, wittingly or unwittingly, that impose a great burden on business. While business is focusing on the big issues we tend to ignore the minor day-to-day interferences that cost us money and slow us down. The title of his speech was repeated at just the right time throughout his presentation, in that patented stentorian voice. It was "While you

are watching out for the eagles you are being pecked to death by the ducks." And that was my introduction to the famous Glen Woodard vocabulary and the beginning of a long professional relationship as well as a personal friendship.

To Glen, a Congressman or a Senator was always addressed as "my spiritual advisor." Glen Woodard's world was not populated by lawyers, accountants and ordinary citizens but by "skin 'em and cheat 'ems," "shiny britches," and "snuff dippers." These people don't merely get excited they have "rollin' of the eyes" and "jerkin' of the navel." Colorful he was. But Glen needed that light-hearted perspective to survive, for Glen was in the middle of what is now called "that mess in Washington" from Presidents Eisenhower to Clinton. Working his contacts, talking to representatives and senators, walking his beat—those endless marble corridors of power—doing as he put it "the work of the Lord." And, indeed, his work affected the law of the land.

And, indeed, that work was made a lot more fun for all of us by Glen's marvelous sense of humor and his wonderful delivery. I remember a meeting a few years ago with a top official in the Treasury Department. We had been stymied for years trying to change a ridiculous IRS regulation because of the stubbornness of one particular bureaucrat. One day Glen broke the logjam as follows: "Jerry, I had occasion to pay you a high compliment when I was with the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee last week. I said you were just great with numbers. In fact, you're the biggest 2-timin', 4-flushin', SOB I've ever known." He got the point and the rule was changed.

With all his blunt talk and tough wit, he was a kind and generous man. In fact, my wife described him when she first met him as courtly and gallant. That was at a luncheon at the Grand Old Opry years ago. My mother was also present and Glen was with his beloved Miss Ann. My mother was so charmed that for the rest of her life she always asked me "How is that wonderful gentleman from Winn-Dixie that you introduced me to in Nashville." Of course, Tab got to know the total Glen over the ensuing years at the many private dinners the three of us enjoyed when Glen was in Washington and had a free evening.

Those of us who worked at the Food Marketing Institute during Glen Woodard's career knew the many facets of this fine man. Always with us when we needed him, he was a brother to me and he was Uncle Glen to the young people on the staff.

Those young people he mentored over the years—young people now mature—carry the principles and values that he lived and taught. Here are some of them:

Integrity—stick to your principles.

Strength and toughness—take a position and stand on it.

Work ethic—It may not be fun at first. If you work hard enough you'll enjoy it.

Responsibility—Take it. Most people duck it.

Generosity—Take the blame; share the credit.

Reliability—Say what you'll do and then do it.

Fairness—It isn't winning if you cheat.

And finally, Grace under pressure.

On behalf of those young people, Glen, I say you brought a great deal of nobility to our day-to-day lives and you made us feel worthwhile.

A few years ago we tricked Glen into coming to a testimonial dinner on his behalf. He thought it was for someone else. The dinner menu was designed especially to Glen's taste. He always said he was sick of overcooked beef, rubber chicken and livers wrapped in burnt bacon. So we had a Glen

Woodard menu prepared at one of the fanciest private clubs in Washington—The F Street Club. Their kitchen staff will never forget it. We had country ham, redeye gravy and biscuits with collard greens. We had cat fish, hush puppies and cole slaw. All the condiments were served in their original containers—ketchup in the bottle, mustard in the jar, and alongside each table in a silver ice bucket we had Glen's cheap rose' wine in a screw-top bottle.

The FMI staff had prepared a special plaque for this man who already had a wall covered with plaques, but this was different and it expressed how the staff felt about him. It went this way: "FMI to Glen P. Woodard, the Best There Is."

For nearly 30 years you have served your company and our industry in the area of public affairs with unparalleled skill and devotion. Currently chairman of the FMI Government Relations Committee, recent Chairman of the FMI Fall Conference, untiring laborer in the vineyards of government on behalf of the American food system, you have accomplished mightily for our industry.

We salute your dedication, your knowledge, your wit and your style. And we treasure your friendship. You are, indeed, The Best There Is. And we love you. Washington, D.C., October 22, 1985.

And that still goes Glen, old buddy.

IS CONGRESS IRRESPONSIBLE? THE VOTERS HAVE SAID YES!

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the impression will not go away: The enormous Federal debt greatly resembles the well-known energizer bunny we see, and see, and see on television. The Federal debt keeps going and going and going—always at the expense, of course, of the American taxpayer.

A lot of politicians talk a good game—when they are back home—about bringing Federal deficits and the Federal debt under control. But so many of these same politicians regularly voted in support of bloated spending bills during the 103d Congress—which may have been one factor in the new configuration of U.S. Senators for the 104th Congress.

There is a rather distressing fact as the 104th Congress moves along: As of Friday, March 10, 1995, the Federal debt stood—down to the penny—at exactly \$4,847,327,170.23 or \$18,400.54 per person.

Mr. President, my hope is that the 104th Congress can bring under control the outrageous spending that created this outrageous debt. If the party now controlling both Houses of Congress, as a result of the November elections last year, does not do a better job of getting a handle on this enormous debt, the American people are not likely to overlook it in 1996.

DR. RICHARD C. HALVERSON

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, last Friday marked the official last day of duty for our Senate Chaplain, the Reverend Richard C. Halverson. I want to take just a moment to pay tribute to his service to the Senate as an institution and a word of thanks for his ministry to Senators as individuals.